

# Humanist

## World Digest

Vol. 30, No. 2  
MAY, 1958

1011 Heinz Avenue  
BERKELEY, CALIFORNIA

COPY 40¢  
\$1.50 A YEAR

### The Fourth Faith

By Stephen H. Fritchman

### Liberty or Freedom

By Dr. Alexander Meiklejohn

### The Liberal View of Prayer and Meditation

By Dr. Harold Scott

### Discrimination Costs Money

#### EDITORIAL

NEWS AND VIEWS

IDEALS TO LIVE BY

#### THE IDEAL OF HUMANISM

We are seeking to present Humanism as a religious philosophy which denies no particular faith, but which provides a path over which all people can travel toward a unity that rises above the barriers of the beliefs which divide them. In behalf of this common faith, we emphasize a constructive approach rather than opposition to traditional philosophies.

PUBLISHED BY THE HUMANIST WORLD FELLOWSHIP,  
INCORPORATED IN CALIFORNIA AS A NON-PROFIT ORGANIZATION  
FOR EDUCATIONAL AND RELIGIOUS PURPOSES.

# TEN AIMS OF HUMANIST WORLD FELLOWSHIP

- 1—Full endorsement of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights approved by the General Assembly of the United Nations at the Plenary meeting December 10, 1948, and world-wide implementation and fulfillment of those rights at the earliest possible moment.
- 2—The use of science to serve society, creatively, constructively, and altruistically in the preservation of life, the production of abundance of goods and services, and the promotion of health and happiness.
- 3—The establishment and furthering of scientific integral education in all schools and colleges so as to emancipate all peoples from the thralldom of ignorance, superstition, prejudices and myths which impede individual development and forestall social progress.
- 4—The widest promotion of the creative arts so as to release all potential artistic abilities and raise the general level of artistic appreciation.
- 5—The increase of social, recreational and travel activities in order to broaden the outlook and improve the intercultural understanding among all peoples.
- 6—A quickened conservation of the world's natural resources, including human resources, so as to arrest their wasteful exhaustion and wanton destruction and thus insure their longest preservation and widest beneficial use for man's survival on this planet.
- 7—The inauguration of a world-wide economy of abundance through national economic planning and international economic cooperation so as to provide a shared plenty for all peoples.
- 8—The advancement of the good life on the basis of a morality determined by historical human experience and contemporary scientific research.
- 9—The development of a coordinated private, cooperative and public medical program which will provide preventive as well as curative medicine and include adequate public health education and personal health counseling.
- 10—The expansion of United Nations functions (1) to include international police power with sufficient armed forces to prevent war and (2) international economic controls capable of preventing world-wide monopolies and/or cartels.

(Successor to WELCOME NEWS)

## HUMANIST WORLD DIGEST

A Quarterly of Liberal Religion

E. O. Corson, Editor. Editorial Associates: Dr. Phillip B. Oliver, Dr. Norval E. Packwood, Rev. Eugene William Kreves. Entered as second-class matter at the Post Office at Berkeley, California, under the act of March 3, 1879. Publication Committee: Dr. Harold Scott, chairman; Kenneth S. Brown, vice-chairman. E. O. Corson, Business Manager. Subscription Rate: \$1.50 per year. Vol. 30, No. 2, April - May - June, 1958. All rights reserved. The Humanist World Fellowship, 1011 Heinz Avenue, Berkeley, Calif.

The responsibility of signed articles in this magazine is accepted by the writers and does not necessarily reflect the views of the Humanist World Digest. Permission granted for reproduction of original articles when proper credit is given.

---

## THE FOURTH FAITH

### A DEFINITION OF 20TH CENTURY RELIGIOUS HUMANISM

by Stephen H. Fritchman

This sermon is in part a review of the book "Humanism as the Next Step" by Carl and Mary Morain, Beacon Press.

During the past few years we have commented several times on the anti-intellectual climate in much of America. Nowhere is this climate more evident, at this hour, than in our religious life. I shall present today a minority position in American religion. Even though it is one held by eminent and highly successful men of the professions, of industry and science, and shared by thoughtful people in all parts of the world, it is still generally dismissed as heretical or utopian, according to the critic. But I rejoice that in the Unitarian churches of this and other nations, the discussion of humanism is not something presented at the risk of one's status in the church or community. We operate on a free mind principle and our greatness for four centuries as Unitarians has been our hospitality to the advocacy of radical thought, even thought proscribed in most churches.

The Humanist point of view is still a minority position in the Unitarian denomination, though that of a large minority. Its opponents often say, with some overtones of wishful thinking, that it is a dead issue. In the present period of religious reorientation in America independent thought has become, with some, unfashionable. I trust this will never be the case in this church, for any point of view whatever. Independency of mind is our stock in trade, our Shekinah, our one most acknowledged grace of spirit. There are many avenues to truth and goodness; poetry, art, music, philosophy, the sharing of common human tasks of service, but one of them never to be underestimated in a day of conformity is strong individual thinking with the best tools that lie around us, the heritage of past thinking, the resources



of newly discovered thought. May the blight of anti-intellectualism never corrupt our fellowship as liberals in this church or in our wider movement because of any failure on our part.

With this as a base, let us now see the reason for this subject, **The Fourth Faith: A Definition of 20th Century Religious Humanism.** While I took the title from the first chapter of Carl and Mary Moran's book, **Humanism as the Next Step**, I am speaking very much out of my own mind and heart. This is no academic matter. A man needs a philosophy of life, or a religious faith, to live with effectiveness and power today. We cannot avoid inner destruction of the soul unless we have some principles and concepts that give us a base in times of great turbulence. Of course, in a church of over a thousand members there is a wide diversity of ideas about such faith, but a minister must express his own in the hope that others will thereby find courage to express theirs. The strength of Unitarianism for 400 years has been its honest effort to say only what we mean, much or little, and say it with simplicity and tolerance for differing opinion and conviction.

On several occasions in the past few years I have given addresses on the question of how many Unitarians think of God. I tried then, as I shall in the future, to state with understanding and sympathy (if not agreement) the modern theistic position. It is a far cry from the fundamental doctrine of God from which most of us have long since departed. One cannot in a single sermon discuss the reasoned thinking of theism and humanism, and those who may not have heard the earlier addresses should secure "Axioms of Freedom" from our literature table and read the first chapter on the idea of God. The minister speaks only for himself and at no time is our principle of diversity of doctrine more obviously practiced than when we talk of our theist and humanist convictions.

Humanism in religion is this country's strong challenge to the orthodoxy of three familiar faiths: Catholicism, Protestantism and Judaism. It is, as we shall see, a fourth faith for millions of Americans (to say nothing of the rest of the world) . . . a faith that makes sense in the face of a radical change of outlook in this century. Humanism starts with the perspective of man's existence in this world. It candidly accepts the full import of modern knowledge about man and the cosmos . . . and it sets for itself human objectives, personal and social, with a naturalistic world view as the background. It starts with a realistic appraisal, not a utopian dream. It starts with the assumption

that the resources for a good and meaningful life are possible without despair, and it feels there is a good warrant for saying that a far better world is within the grasp of modern man if he will make use of all that lies about him of knowledge, of technology, of human dynamics. Humanism feels there is no need for supernatural supplements . . . except by those who have not learned to do without them. (I say this knowing that advertising methods and mass campaigns of promotion are being exploited today to make us think we cannot do without the supernatural, crudely presented by Mr. Jaggars or stated with great sophistication by Dr. Niebuhr or Bishop Sheen.)

We are not speaking today of skepticism and agnosticism—both of which are far too negative and defeatist to serve the needs of healthy men and women. There is need for passion and enthusiasm and confidence in humanity which skepticism and agnosticism do not possess by definition. But the passion and enthusiasm can be constructive and this-worldly. They can work through a democratic philosophy and without ancient accompaniments or transcendental theology or cultus.

Humanism builds squarely on the universal idea of brotherhood and the operation of the free mind seeking truth. It is content with fixing the eyes upon this earth and this cosmos. It is a religion without a personal God, a divine revelation, or a sacred scripture. It recognizes that sorrows and joys, tragedies and triumphs touch all human beings and that there is much that is unknown and unexplored in reality . . . even though the borders of knowledge move outward with every passing decade.

Since the humanist in the 20th century accepts no official religious authority as spokesman he finds many individuals composing definitions of religion . . . and this he likes and welcomes. One humanist, Julian Huxley, the scientist, speaks of religion as the consciousness of sanctity in existence, in common things, in the events of human life. One of the early American pioneers of humanism in this century, Dr. John H. Dietrich, writes of the matter in these words:

“For centuries the idea of God has been the very heart of religion: it has been said, ‘No God, no religion’. But humanism thinks of religion as something very different and far deeper than a belief in God. To it, religion is not the attempt to establish right relations with a supernatural being, but rather the up-reaching and aspiring impulse in a human life. It is life striving



for its complete fulfillment, and anything that contributes to that fulfillment is religious, whether associated with the idea of God or not." To the humanist **religion is the creation and pursuit of ideals and values and the relationship men feel with one another and with the universe.** It includes the pursuit of such truth as man can grasp from his point of vantage on this planet set in the galactic universe.

Let us remember that this formulation of humanism takes shape and color in a 20th century world of science and democracy but it has been evolving for centuries and the early humanists (most glorious company indeed) have given us clues and examples for a very long time.

Because humanism is a positive faith and not a negation let us note seven ideas which form its structure . . . an arbitrary list to be sure, but one that will give us something to discuss later when we meet after the service. Some of the seven points shade into each other but still we can point to these seven ideas as fundamental.

1. **Life can and should be experienced deeply, lived fully with a sensitive awareness and appreciation of what lies around us now.** Artists and explorers are supreme examples of this quality. The humanist therefore embraces a Whitman, a Goya or a Mozart even more than a theologian or a delver into metaphysics. With Epicurus and Lucretius we seek to find happiness in the present world rather than hoping for a heaven elsewhere.

Second: **Humanists insist that nature is most worthy of enjoyment and attention.** We honor Aristotle as a man who made discovery of nature a central enterprise of the mature person. We find a Copernicus or a Galileo figure more worthy of emulation than a mystic in a monastery or a St. Anthony in the desert. The modern humanist has a special gratitude for Protagoras 500 years before Christ saying **"Man is the measure of all things"** and preaching, if you will, a materialism not unlike the materialism of an astronomer such as Dr. Fred Hoyle today. It is high time we caught up with Protagoras in realizing that a materialistic humanism has more future as a religion than a rapidly dissolving Platonic idealism with its essences and divine ideas. The humanist is more indebted to Francis Bacon leading the revolt against medieval scholasticism and opening doors to the scientific method, than to a St. Augustine or a John Calvin with their particular forms of authoritarian supernaturalism.

The saints (if you wish to use such a term) of humanism are

men and women like Spinoza, Heraclitus, Mme. Curie and George H. Mead . . . to give a few random examples . . . persons to whom the world of nature is fully adequate for interpreting the values of life and giving the warmth and security man needs for a full experience.

**Third: The humanist actually does have confidence in man.** The ancient revealed religions sometimes rise to such a statement, **but do not sustain it** . . . eventually they sink back into the view that man rests on God for security and strength. Not until the renaissance did this confidence in man become a tidal wave of energy under leadership from men like Leonardo da Vinci and Castellio . . . and in the 18th century with men who advocated the use of reason fully: Voltaire, Helvitius, Jefferson and Paine . . . and who encouraged others to distrust and shed the tyrannies of priests and kings and schoolmen over the minds of men. They urged all men to investigate and to question. And this is a deep cutting idea which it is hard to accept unless one sees its far-reaching implications. John Herman Randall, Jr., some years ago put the challenge well when he said:

"History is an alternation of two moods. There is the mood of supernaturalism, a mood of dependence and self-abnegation, a bitter realization of frustration and failure, in which man's confidence oozes to nothingness, **and there is the humanistic mood involving man the creator and builder.**"

**Fourth: The humanist, unlike the orthodox faiths, with rare heretical exceptions, proposes to live on the theory that men have equal rights.** Not only is there intrinsic value in each of us, **but there is a basic equality among us.** While thousands, yes hundreds of thousands, still are taught to bend a knee at a Papal audience or to curtsy before a Queen or secure slaves for a feudal Arabian overlord, far more millions today have caught hold of the 19th and 20th century idea of equality that Bolivar and Lincoln and Lenin taught to millions. In South America, in the United States and in the Soviet countries a lot has gone astray of that concept . . . but this we humanists believe . . . that the democratic idea of equality has captured the planet and it will prevail at whatever price is necessary. This is a primary faith of the humanist here or anywhere else in the world. I do not minimize the damage done by a weak or evil leadership anywhere, **but I do not think for a sustained period this 19th century concept of equality can be repealed** . . . it can only be delayed in its full achievement.



**Fifth: The humanist places great importance upon the value of brotherhood and mutual aid.** While this has been a core idea of the great religions: Buddhism, Christianity, Judaism and others, it can now be given naturalistic roots by sociologists and biologists, and be freed of the destructive class and race restrictions which over the centuries have vitiated so much of the teaching. In 5th century BC Greece one can find obscure philosophers who had a glimpse of the ideal of the brotherhood in a humanistic context. Antiphon, the sophist, and Alcidas taught, "By nature we are all alike, Greeks and barbarians." In Philemon we actually find the statement, "All men are free, nature has not made any man a slave." But this is many centuries ahead of its time as a working or practiced idea . . . it is not found in Aristotle or Plato or any of the great Greek philosophers.

The modern humanist feels that mutual aid and brotherhood as stated in ancient religions and philosophies remained unmotivated . . . it was an ethical injunction, a preachment of perfection, with little to commend it to the average man working to make secure himself and his family from the perils of starvation, sickness and the assaults of rival tribes or nations.

Today, and for the past 100 years, the scientist (still only half habilitated as a friend of mankind because of his destructive role in war making) **has begun to show us how cooperation in a real sense is important for our survival on this earth.** Kropotkin and others spelled out the role of mutual aid. Patten, the paleontologist, found in cooperation the **grand strategy of evolution.** Bernard's zoological research revealed that the development of higher forms of life was made possible by the progressive cooperation of cells.

The humanist, as Corliss Lamont has said so well, feels it is essential to carry out a systematic and skillful program of training the **motives** and the **emotions** so that the social and sympathetic tendencies of human beings will be encouraged rather than the egoistic ones.

**Sixth: The humanist is dedicated to the concept of evolution** and the implications of the idea in terms of development through gradual change. The revealed religions have never resolved the contradiction of **revealed final truths** from God and the **dynamic theory of natural evolution in a natural universe.**

This idea of evolution has been a long time coming and has met stiff resistance all the way. It had momentary beginnings in Lucretius and Heraclitus 2000 years ago, but a scientific ap-



proach is no more than a hundred years old. Even today there is little room for us to speak in finalities. Dr. Fred Hoyle, the British astronomer, in a delightful little book just published, entitled "Man and Materialism," reflects this openness and modesty of the scientific humanist today when he says, "Considerable progress can be made toward understanding man's relation to the Universe. This can be done without any of the ancient beliefs, and without 'faith'. The purely scientific approach to such issues as life, death and soul already reveals more in the way of remarkable conclusions than we might have expected. The picture is far from complete. Science is still at the beginning of the road. Recent studies in the ultra small in nuclear physics and the ultra large in astronomy have made it plain that there are whole worlds of understanding still to be opened to us." That quotation is characteristic of the modesty of the Humanist temper that accepts evolution rather than revelation in religion.

**Seventh: The Humanist feels the need for proving theory by repeatedly testing experience.** This is a key concept in the world-wide humanist movement which under many names and from many historic religious faiths is drawing ever greater support. This testing of theory by experience is, of course, the very heart of the scientific method. But it is more than something for the laboratory and the industrial proving ground; it is also for our own daily living of the good life, and for the making of a personal philosophy. It is a major tool in one's total adjustment to the world we live in, in human relation, in knowing ourselves.

These are the seven pillars, if you will, of a humanist structure . . . call it a faith if you wish . . . it certainly has the substance of a rational and imaginative and emotionally satisfying religion . . . if we so choose. It seems to me we have an opportunity to enter into the building of a religious movement from our own Unitarian vantage point which will link us with liberal humanists in the Islamic world, the Hindu, the Jewish and the Christian . . . a movement that will increasingly be independent and strong in its own fellowship . . . a movement that will give full scope to the potentialities of man, his dignity, gentleness and creativity.

And in closing let me share with you the words of the Nobel Prize winner last year, Dr. Albert Schweitzer, who faced himself the criticism so often made that humanism is too earthly, too lacking in inspiration and emotion for the average man or woman. He wrote: "The world thinks it must raise itself above human-

ism; that it must look for a more profound spirituality. But it has taken a false road. Humanism in all its simplicity is **the only genuine spirituality**. Only ethics and religion, which include in themselves the humanitarian ideal, have true value. Humanism is the most precious result of rational meditation upon our existence and that of the world."

\* \* \*

## LIBERTY OR FREEDOM\*

by Dr. Alexander Meiklejohn

I thank you from the bottom of my heart for the friendliness which you show me this evening. All the time allotted to me on this program could easily be spent in expressing the happiness you give me. But the Scottish inheritance which still lingers in my blood tells me that, on public occasions such as this, I should not talk about my feelings more than is necessary. I beg you, therefore, to take that single opening sentence as expressing an appreciation which is very warm and which, I hope, will reveal itself in many outspoken ways as you and I go on working for the cultivation of Freedom, as well as for the defense of it, in the nation which has our allegiance.

My topic for this evening was easily chosen. You and I who have banded ourselves together chiefly in the interest of Political Freedom may profitably spend some time in trying to discover both what Political Freedom is and what it is not. There is something to be gained by seeing the target at which you shoot. And I am sure that an intelligent answering the question here suggested would do more for the health of our own national life, more for the improving of our relations with other nations, more for the peace and happiness and virtue of mankind, than any other achievement which is now open to the American People. I wish, therefore, that we, as members and friends of the Civil Liberties Union, could come to grips with the intellectual task of discovering what, in the view of the Constitution of the United States, the term "Political Freedom" means. Let us take warning from the fact that, for the most part, those so-called McCarthyites who attack what we think to be Freedom do so in defense of something else which they think to be freedom. And so long as that misunderstanding remains between us the use of bludgeons, legal or non-legal, upon one another can have little

---

\*Address delivered at the twenty-third anniversary meeting of the American Civil Liberties Union of Northern California, held at the Sheraton-Palace Hotel, San Francisco, October 29, 1957, at which Dr. Meiklejohn was the honored guest.



permanent effectiveness. I ask you, therefore, to join with me in consideration of the dominant motive which animates every provision of the Constitution of the United States. We shall not be asking, "How does that Constitution protect our Freedom?" We shall be asking, "What is the Freedom which the Constitution creates?" As I present this question to you I shall, in the main, be saying things which I have said many times before. I hope that you will forgive me for doing that. I will try to justify it by gathering together those remarks into what might be called "A Confession of Faith."

The task in which I invite your cooperation is that of trying to draw a clear and usable distinction between "Freedom" and "Liberty." Those two words are, as you know, constantly used when we talk about the relations between individual citizens and the governing agencies which those citizens have collectively established. In our common usage the two terms are practically interchangeable. I hope to persuade you to so define them and use them that Freedom will be for you a thing radically different from Liberty and Liberty radically different from Freedom. I am, you see, advocating semantic reform. That reform is needed in order that we may avoid confusions which seem to me constantly to beset such discussions as those of the Civil Liberties Union, or, it may be, even those of the Supreme Court of the United States. Perhaps I should, at this point, warn you that my suggestion, if taken seriously, might bring about the insertion of the word "Freedom" into the name of the "Civil Liberties" Union.

As already suggested, the two terms, when used in our interpretations of the Constitution, refer to limitations which that sovereign document sets to the jurisdiction, the authority, of Congress. But the crucial fact is that those limitations are of two kinds, very different from one another. And that difference is so deep and so significant that a verbal usage which confuses them is, for purposes of understanding, a direct invitation to intellectual disaster. In view of their previous interchangeability, it would be a matter of indifference which of the two terms, Freedom or Liberty, were applied to one or the other of the two sets of limitations. All that is essential is the recognition that whenever we speak of Freedom we refer to one of these sets of regulations, and that Liberty always refers to the other. The contrast between the two ways in which the Constitution limits the authority of Congress can be clearly seen if we place

side by side the First and the Fifth Amendments, as they appear in the Bill of Rights. The First Amendment speaks of four Political Freedoms—the freedom of speech, of press, of assembly, and of petition. And its uncompromising proclamation is that no governing agency has any authority whatever to abridge those freedoms of ours. The Fifth Amendment, on the other hand, speaks of life, liberty, and property. And these, which we commonly call our "Liberties" or, perhaps, our "Rights," are all alike placed within the scope of legislative restraint. The Declaration of Independence, it is true, had made the flaming pronouncement that "all men are endowed by their Creator with unalienable rights" and that "among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." But the Constitution, apparently in flat contradiction of the earlier document,—if poetry can be contradicted by prose—soberly provides that the government may, for good reason and by proper procedure, take from us our liberties, wholly or in part. Whenever the public need seems to justify such action, free citizens may be required to go into battle, to take other men's lives, to lose their own; their business activities may be regulated, their incomes subjected to unequal taxation; they may be told when and where and how they are to speak, and when and where and how they are forbidden to do so. And this implies that speech, press, assembly, and petition, insofar as they are used for purposes other than the governing of the nation are, in fact, subject to regulation in exactly the same sense as is walking, or lighting a fire, or shooting a gun.

The problem involved in the distinction between Freedom and Liberty, as those words are used in the Bill of Rights, can now, I think, be simply stated. On the one hand we have, in our communication with each other and with our Representatives, **Liberties** of Speech, Press, Assembly, and Petition. On the other hand, we have, also, **Freedoms** of Speech, Press, Assembly, and Petition. Those Liberties, on grounds of public welfare, may be abridged by Congressional action. But the Freedoms, in virtue of the fundamental purpose of the Constitution, are forever beyond the reach of Congressional control.

It does not fall within the scope of this brief Confession of Faith to attempt a listing of all those restrictions of the Liberties of Speech, Press, Assembly and Petition which our many governing agencies are authorized to make. They are multifarious and unending. It has been decided, for example, that in our



communications with one another we are not at liberty to engage in certain forms of libel or slander, in attacks on public morals, or in incitements to riot. On high authority, it has been declared that when there is no fire breaking out in a theatre, it is a crime to shout "Fire," and so cause a panic. A much debated question has recently arisen concerning the authority of Congressional investigating committees. Does the Un-American Activities Committee of the House, when it seeks to compel testimony concerning beliefs, advocacies, and associations, assume control over our Freedoms or only over our Liberties? By action of the Supreme Court that question seems happily to be coming near to a sensible answer. But, however that may be, it is certain that under the Constitution, limitations upon our Liberties of Communication are great in number and of many kinds.

But the major issue about which you and I are now reflecting is to be found on the other, the Freedom, side of the question. What authority have we, the People, delegated to our Legislators to abridge, not our Liberties, but our Freedoms? And here there is no listing to be done. On the contrary, we are met by a single uncompromising denial of jurisdiction. "Congress shall make no law" abridging Political Freedom, is the form which the Constitutional provision takes. In order to understand that declaration we need to determine, first, what Freedom is as a working principle and, then, why, within the general structure of the Constitution, the purpose underlying that principle is the foundation stone upon which our Plan of Government rests.

As some of you know, I have tried many times to formulate the working principle of Freedom. The statement which thus far comes nearest to satisfying me reads as follows:

If then, on any occasion in the United States, it is allowable to say that the Constitution is a good document, it is equally allowable, in that situation, to say that the Constitution is a bad document. If a public building may be used in which to say, in time of war, that the war is justified, then the same building may be used in which to say that it is not justified. If it be publicly argued that conscription for armed service is moral and necessary, it may be likewise publicly argued that it is immoral and unnecessary. If it may be said that American political institutions are superior to those of England or Russia or Germany, it may, with equal freedom, be said that those of England or Russia or Germany are superior to ours. These conflicting views may be expressed, must be expressed, not because they are valid, but because they are

relevant. If they are responsibly entertained by anyone, we the voters need to hear them. Where a question of policy is "before the house," free men choose to meet it, not with their eyes shut, but with their eyes open. To be afraid of ideas, of any idea, is to be unfit for self-government. Any such suppression of ideas about the common good, the First Amendment condemns with its absolute disapproval. The freedom of ideas shall not be abridged.

But, further, why must ideas, our holding and criticizing of them, our expressing and hearing or reading of them, be free, be kept within our own control? The answer to that question lies in the fact that the Constitution of the United States attempts to express, in legal enactments, the most revolutionary principle which has ever emerged to guide the political activities of Mankind. It is both destructive of an old legal order and creative of a new one. It is the principle that men shall be governed, directly or indirectly, only by themselves. Throughout human history, as men have formed political groups, arbitrary and irresponsible power has asserted itself. By force or guile or by both of them, ruling individuals and ruling classes have established their authority for the making and executing of judgments concerning the general welfare. And their fellow members of the group have been politically subject to them, have been required to obey their laws, to pledge loyalty to them as rulers, to accept an inferior political status.

I need not remind you that, as our Anglo-American political tradition has been made and re-made, the under-dogs of a stratified society have, for centuries, struggled to secure their Liberties and Freedoms from the repressions of the top-dogs who, officially or unofficially, have ruled over them. But the significance of our own Constitution in the winning of that fight can be seen only as we sharply distinguish between the Liberties and the Freedoms around which the battles have raged.

With respect to the Liberties, which we call "The Rights of the Governed," the Constitution says little that is new. In the main, it records the victories, the concessions, which British and Colonial "subjects" had won from the "masters" who ruled over them. Habeas corpus, due process, equality before the law, non-self-incrimination, and so on, were already recognized as principles which should be observed. And that means that the tradition of Liberty has been continuous, running, precedent by precedent, from early days in Britain to present days in the United States.



But the Constitution, when it deals with Freedom, proclaims, not Continuity, but Revolution. In this field old precedents are neither valid nor even relevant. The Constitution intends, by one smashing blow, to destroy the status system under which some men claim authority to govern others. Henceforth all men, as a body politic, are to govern themselves. That is what Political Freedom means. With respect to the Freedom of Speech, Press, Assembly, and Petition, there is a radical, a revolutionary, distinction between the old system and the new. Under the old system, kings, parliaments, councils, granted to their subjects such Rights or Liberties of Speech, Press, Assembly, or Petition, as they, in their wisdom, deemed wise or expedient. Under the new system, a Free People, while delegating limited powers to their Representatives, reserve to themselves unqualified authority to carry on, in all its forms, that process of judgment-making in which Self-Government consists. Under our Constitution, Political Freedom is not a Private Right, granted to us by someone else. It is a Public Power, a Public Responsibility, which, as free men, we will not delegate to anyone else. The series of historical events by which that change came about was not merely a military rebellion. It was a Political and Legal Revolution.

The last step in our attempt to track down the meaning of Freedom must be a long leap from the field of Political Administration into the field of Political Education. And since that leap must be abruptly and hurriedly taken, I choose to borrow words from the man who seems to me to be the greatest popular teacher of Freedom whom our Western culture has known. I refer to the wise and witty Greek slave, Epictetus, who taught his Roman masters about a Freedom which they, with all their wealth and power, and mighty legal code, could never win, but which gave to him in his servitude, a free and happy and triumphant career. "No man is free," said Epictetus, "who does not govern himself." And when that moral maxim is translated into political terms, it means—No society is free unless all its members have not only the opportunity, but also the capacity and the eagerness to share actively in the governing of the common life. As we of the Civil Liberties Union rush to protect the freedoms of speech, press, assembly, and petition from external interference, we should remember those words. When we successfully protect a citizen's authority to speak about matters of public interest, not much has been gained for Political Freedom unless the man protected has the capacity and eagerness to say something about those interests, and to say it effectively. We of the

Union will defend to the death a citizen's access to the ballot-box, but our efforts are futile if he decides not to go to the polls or, if when he does go, his ballot is meaningless because he does not understand what the voting is about. Beneath all the busy and rattling machinery of our political life, the Constitution of the United States presupposes that there is running through the life of the community a deep and powerful current of judgment-making about the common welfare, in which every citizen is able and willing to share. Only insofar as all the citizens of this nation are bound together in a common and generous attempt to gather information about the forces and circumstances of the common life, to interpret that information in its bearing upon our national interests, and, thereby to decide cooperatively what shall be done and what shall not be done by the body politic—only as those conditions are met, is there any meaning in the assertion that we are a self-governing nation, a Free People. May I sum it up by quoting again from Epictetus words which I have often used to explain the purpose of all our teaching in schools and colleges? He tells us, "The Rulers of the State have said that only Free Men shall be educated: but Reason says that only educated men shall be Free."

I need not remind members of this Union how far the current practices of our nation fall short of the basic intention of the Constitution. Our creating of a Free Society is still in its crude beginnings. Sadly it must be said that when we speak of ourselves as "Free," we are commonly thinking of our Liberties rather than of our Freedoms. And, for that reason, our Liberties are constantly used as weapons with which to destroy our Freedoms. May I briefly indicate, without discussion, three points at which that destruction is going on?

First, a hundred years ago we fought a dreadful Civil War. It was fought, and apparently won, because millions of our fellow citizens, on grounds of race and color, had been debarred from effective sharing in the decision-making activity which is Political Freedom. But today, the nations of the world stand aghast before the fact that, though the Fourteenth Amendment announced a victory for Freedom, that victory has, in too large measure, been nullified by a sectional demand for Liberties which, in the plan of the Constitution, is explicitly denied.

Second, during the past twenty-five years, new forms of mass communication have been devised which, if used for purposes of education, might bring the body-politic of the United States, and even of the world, into forms of acquaintance and mutual



understanding which would serve us well in the creating of a society of Freedom. But, instead of that, radio and television, being handed over to the Liberties of private enterprise, have become mighty forces for the breaking down both of our morals and our intelligence. They have again made dominant in our society the mental trickeries which, long ago, Plato saw corrupting the mind and spirit of Athens. I do not deny that good men are at work in the industries or that good work is done. But on the whole, a great chance for the cultivation of Freedom has been lost. In my opinion, Madison Avenue is, today, more powerful and more dangerous than the hydrogen bomb.

And, third, our colleges are, in large measure, deserting the teaching of Freedom in order that they may meet the clamorous demands that they equip their students with the techniques and devices of Industrial and Business and Military Efficiency. Among the professors the search for specialized knowledge is replacing the search for liberal understanding. Our institutions of learning are becoming less and less self-governing and independent. Under the pressures of a multiplicity of alien forces, scholars and teachers protect their Liberties but lose sight of the Intellectual Freedom by which alone their work can be justified.

But enough of lamentation and fault-finding! I have cited these failures only for the sake of making clear what is the goal which, in some measure, we are failing to reach. My Confession of Faith has to do only with an attempt to see as clearly as I can what is the Freedom by which the Constitution of the United States is inspired. May I then, returning to the poetic mood in which I was introduced, read to you as my closing words, a poem written by Rabindranath Tagore about his country, India? He says, in meaningful poetry, what I have been trying to say about the United States, my country.

“Where the mind is without fear, and the head is held high;  
Where knowledge is free;

Where the world has not been broken up into fragments  
by narrow domestic walls:

Where words come out from the depth of truth;

Where tireless striving stretch its arms toward perfection;

Where the clear stream of reason has not lost its way into  
the dreary desert sand of dead habit;

Where the mind is led forward into ever-widening thought  
and action.

Into that heaven of freedom, let my country awake.”

# LIBERAL VIEW OF PRAYER AND MEDITATION

by Dr. Harold Scott

Can modern man pray? Prayer grew out of the effort of primitive man to scare away bad spirits and get the good spirits on his side. Primitive people also used feasts, dances, fasting, beating of drums, incantations and all sorts of rites. They all had for their purpose the establishment of right relations between the worshipper and deity or the tribe and deity.

The Hebrews composed and conserved prayers that in their day were of great literary merit, but they reflect a conception of deity that today the science of religion must regard as superstitious. The main theme seems to be that Jehovah is taking care of the Jews. All I have to say to that is that considering the unjust and terrible persecutions heaped upon the Jews, if God has been taking care of them, he has done a mighty poor job of it. The Union Prayer Book for Jewish Worship edited by the Central Conference of American Rabbis expresses a more reasonable theology.

The Catholic church in its Roman Missal and the Episcopal church in its Prayer Book both have prayers for many occasions; some of which are of high literary merit, but embody so much of superstition that they are not usable by moderns in religion.

In most Protestant churches the prayer by the minister is impromptu and is likely to consist of fervid outpouring of pious phrases which if written down would have no literary merit nor would it make much sense, only a loose series of religious sounding words. Cultured people cannot get much good from that sort of a performance.

Orthodox Jewish funeral prayers make a direct appeal to God on behalf of the dead; presumably on the theory that God can be induced to change his mind as to his treatment of the dead. The Roman church prays for the dead deeming it will shorten the time the soul has to stay in purgatory before being fit for heaven. The Greek Orthodox church prays for the dead. It doesn't believe in purgatory but considering the uncertainty of place of residence of the dead figures it won't do any harm anyhow. Martin Luther, whom some call the father of Protestantism, approved prayers for the dead.

Perhaps the most characteristic prayer of Protestants is the prayer of petition;—asking for something. If it is true, as two of the gospel writers state, that Jesus taught his disciples the old

Hebrew prayer which we call the Lord's Prayer, Jesus must have believed in this kind of prayer. For it asks for material things, "Give us this day our daily bread." But the writer of the book of Matthew couldn't make up his mind on this. In one place he has Jesus say, "Your father (meaning God) knoweth what things ye have need of before ye ask him (6:8)." If so, it is silly to ask him. But in 7:7 he makes Jesus say, "Ask and it shall be given you." The unknown author of the gospel according to John definitely indorses prayer as petition, that is, asking for things. Of course, moderns cannot settle this or any other question by quoting from the Bible. That never proves anything.

It's typical of Americans that when they pray, they ask for material benefits,—for things. They will take a chance on anything to get hold of property. But of course, the science of religion says ALL this is childish nonsense. Goods are produced only by the application of labor to land. God doesn't run a department store. You cannot order goods from him as from a mail order catalog. Some people are confused about God. They pray as though God were Santa Claus and every day were Christmas. We are a part of a divinely fixed natural order. That being the case, no amount of praying will protect you if you step in front of a rapidly moving automobile. If you fall out of a ten-story window you are going to get hurt and no praying will make it otherwise. If you want more wages praying won't give it to you. Better join a labor union.

God is impersonal law. If you don't have good health better give up alcoholic drinks, don't eat so much, and sleep more.

God is the principle of things as they are. If you are ignorant don't pray for knowledge, enroll for adult education classes, or attend the Unitarian church.

God is natural law. Prayer cannot affect a disturbance in or suspension of natural law. Prayer cannot deliver provisions to men on a raft. Prayer cannot divert a bullet,

All the answers to the questions as to the nature of man and his relation to the universe depend upon the state of human knowledge. As the great scientists make discoveries and accumulate knowledge, religion has to change and be modified. It has always been so. The religion of Moses was not the religion of the Egyptian captivity. The religion of Jeremiah was not the tribal god worship of the time of Moses. The religion of Ezekiel and the Chaldean captivity was not the religion of Jeremiah. And so on. No Protestant church of today is the Protestant church of Calvin. No Methodist church of today is the church



of John Wesley. The world changes: changes physically, man changes physically, and psychologically. His religion changes as he changes and as his knowledge increases and his skills improve. Our ancestors did well for the generations they served. Our generation must serve our generation (as our ancestors did theirs) in the light of present knowledge. He who sits by the side of the road warming himself by the pitiful fire of the creeds of yesterday is a laggard and a shirk. Man is on the march. New adventures of the spirit call. Our faces should be turned toward the future not the past. We must have a religion appropriate for our day. Yes, if we will, we can have tomorrow's religion today.

Liberal religion is a proclamation of emancipation from the religious tyrannies of the past.

Traditional Christianity says, "Have faith and you will be saved." That is have faith in some particular scheme of salvation that was formulated at a time when learning was at its lowest ebb. The savage might with equal logic say, "Have faith in my totem pole and you will be saved."

The liberal proclaims the sanctity of doubt. He asserts the necessity of employing the historical and scientific methods in ascertaining religious truths.

Traditional Christianity says in effect, "In religion I know all, God told me." Science says, "I know little, but that which I assert I have proved." Modesty and common sense impel the liberal to take his stand with science.

Liberal religion is a protest against the claim of finality and infallibility on behalf of venerable authorities. The liberal scans the testimony of history. He sees that in the war between traditional Christianity and science, science has won every encounter. He reviews the multitude of errors in which man has had faith and he decides to precede faith with experiment. He claims that a valid religion must meet the same tests that obtain in any other department of human thinking. The acceptance of any ideas that do not sound pleasant if called "faith," but ignorance or credulity is a more accurate description.

Traditional Christianity proposes too easy a way. It asserts that there are no experts in religion but ancient ones. It is all settled. All we need to do is to "Surrender to Christ," which phrase is but a superstitious war-cry to frighten the timid and ill-informed into surrendering their intelligence to a scheme of post-mortem salvation worked out by other men in less enlightened days.

The religious liberal refuses to do this. He sees every advance humanity has registered has been the triumph of intelligence over error. Also he recognizes the vast moral ministry of science. He breaks utterly with the authoritarian past and seeks to develop a religion that shall be scientifically valid, historically proportionate, and emotionally satisfying.

There is no merit in believing something your reason and commonsense tells you is not true. Calling it faith does not change anything. Our forefathers like us wanted to explain things. That was to their credit. But they did not have the information to make explanations that are valid for us today. Two thousand years hence the best explanations of the science of religion of TODAY will not be good enough for our descendants. It is not to our credit if we accept the explanations of the past instead of these in accord with modern knowledge. We live in a changing universe. We must have a growing changing religion.

---

Salt Lake Unitarian Church radio ministry is supported by the Dollar-A-Month Radio Club. Those who are not members can become members by sending in \$1 to the Unitarian Church, 13th East and 6th South, Salt Lake City 2, Utah.

—IUD Bulletin, January, 1958

\* \* \*

### Employers Learn

## **DISCRIMINATION COSTS MONEY**

American workers—long ago—discovered that racial discrimination is expensive. They learned that beside being morally wrong, such discrimination fanned disunity, weakened their unions and played into the hands of hostile employers.

The early days of our country's labor movement are filled with stories of Negroes being imported as strikebreakers, of minority groups played against one another, and of management fostering tensions between immigrants with different ethnic and religious cultures.

Organized labor has fought this prejudice by working hard to beat down discrimination wherever it raises its ugly head. Management, on the other hand, has no such proud record.

Motivated by selfish interests, America's corporate giants are still using race-hate as a weapon against labor organization and strong, effective trade unionism.

In an effort to halt this continued use of racial prejudice, organized labor has called upon the National Labor Relations Board

to rule that the use of race-hate should be an unfair labor practice.

That some companies are willing to actually dip into their own profits to maintain segregation is proved in a recent article in the Wall Street Journal. The article shows that segregation is costly to employers, just as it is costly to employees.

### **Hits Pocketbook**

According to the Journal: "Each new incident of racial conflict, whether it's over school integration in Little Rock, bus segregation in Tallahassee, Fla., or Negroes' rights to vote in Tuskegee, Ala., sharpens the pains that are hitting a growing number of Dixie businessmen in the pocketbook."

Listed as typical "segregation-caused costs" are such items as duplicated service facilities in Jim Crow areas; elimination of economic plant sites because of white residents' objections to Negro workers nearby; Negro consumer boycotts; and the forgoing of revenue from conventions of "mixed" delegates.

A Southern printing plant owner is quoted as saying that "more and more of us are realizing that segregation has inherent costs, aside from the direct tax cost of maintaining duplicate public facilities, such as schools, for whites and Negroes."

The Journal article provides a number of specific examples of the added costs to businessmen caused by segregation.

Cited as a typical case of extra costs necessitated by duplicate facilities is a new Greyhound terminal in Jacksonville, Fla. The new terminal includes separate rest rooms, duplicate restaurants, waiting rooms and cocktail lounges.

According to Vance Greenslit, president of Southeastern Greyhound Lines, "It frequently costs 50 percent more to build a terminal with segregated facilities."

Since Greyhound plans to put nearly \$7 million into new terminals in the South during the next five years, added segregation expenses are a major item.

Other companies expanding in the South have similar problems. Manufacturers, for example, must expect to build duplicate locker rooms, drinking fountains, cafeterias and washroom facilities when planning a new plant.

The problem of forgoing economic plant sites is typified by the recent experience of Scripto, Inc., which planned to erect a new pen and automatic pencil factory in Atlanta.

Scripto's plans for the proposed \$1.5 million plant were blocked when white people in a nearby residential area objected to the project because a large number of Negroes were to be



employed and would pass through the white area on the way to and from work.

Charles Lovejoy, Scripto's executive vice president, admitted that the loss of the plant site cost the company \$41,000 "because we had to sell the property for less than we paid for it. We don't know how much the litigation and lost time cost us," he added.

Another cost hard to estimate, according to the Journal, is the loss of new business due to racial tension. While some cases are known where prospective manufacturers have decided against moving South because of racial troubles, the majority of firms are reluctant to admit to this reason for fear of losing Southern customers.

"Retailers in many Southern cities have been among the businessman hardest hit by inflamed racial feelings," the Journal declares. The article claims that "Negroes' reluctance to trade with Southern white merchants extends far beyond . . . organized and highly publicized boycotts . . ."

Segregation economics are also found in the entertainment industry. Angered by segregation, Negroes seldom fill the colored galleries of movie theatres, while whites cannot use the empty seats.

In other areas, segregation is costly through a different process. One store considered hiring Negro salesgirls to boost sales, but gave up the plan when threatened with a loss of white business.

Some Southern banks have similar problems. A spokesman for a large bank told the Journal: "We restrict our advertising in Negro newspapers and on Negro radio because we don't want too many Negro customers. . . . It wouldn't do if there were too many Negroes in our lobby."

### **Ulterior Motives**

Faced with these admitted extra costs, it would seem highly practical—even if moral reasons were not considered—for big business to join the fight against discrimination.

Unfortunately, this has not been the case. On the contrary, a number of Northern manufacturers have opened Southern run-away shops and utilized race-hate as a weapon to block unionism and as a device to hold down wages.

Southern industrial groups, anxious to entice corporate expansion into their areas have cooperated with this program. "Right to work" laws, cheap labor and low tax rates are all advertised as advantages for potential plant sites.

These savings more than make up for the additional cost of

discrimination. Under these conditions, it is simply "good business" to spend the extra dollars necessary by segregation as an investment toward the continuation of sweatshop labor.

And, as every executive knows, "good business" never includes moral considerations.

\* \* \*

## LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

To the Editor of LIFE

Dear Sir:

On this Easter Day I have just read your editorial, "Space, History and God" in the April 7th issue of LIFE, having just returned from a trip around the world.

In this, you frankly admit the serious errors of Christianity in opposing scientific discoveries of Galileo and Darwin (and the names could be increased manyfold), but you then go on to try and link up science and religion, tying them both into God's plan. And you tell of the Resurrection as if it were an historical fact, utterly ignoring the works of our great historians and students of early times.

The great Albert Sweitzer wrote, in his autobiography, that no one could prove Christ ever existed; there were no contemporary records, no mention until the year 117 of the Christians—that not a word He ever uttered was recorded, or of anyone who knew Him—that He apparently believed Himself to be the Messiah heralding the end of the world—which didn't happen, so He committed a human error, therefore He must have been human and not divine. And Schweitzer then chose as his religion, "reverence for life."

Read Dr. Smith's great work, "Man and His Gods," foreword of which was written by Einstein. He points out so well the absolute lack of any real knowledge of Christ. The works ascribed to Him, such as the "sermon on the mount" were not His, but a compilation of several later works.

Read Toynbee; read "This Believing World," by Browne. All tell the same story. Christianity is merely the grouping together of legends of the past. These come from decades to centuries later, and in Greek, while the language of the Holy Land was Aramaic. Why maintain otherwise when the facts are so apparent? Truth is paramount and you have done truth a great disservice.

As for God creating the world; read the great English physi-

cist and astronomer, Fred Hoyle's "Approaches to Astronomy." Creation is still going on. Read "The River of Life," also read "Apes, Angels and Victorians", by Irvine. If you read the above and check carefully you can only come to the conclusion that the whole Easter story is a myth.

Historians think Christ was probably born in Herod's reign and as Herod died four years before the Christian Era, our calendar is out at least four years, and probably six.

And, if Christ were crucified, what possible connection can there be between this and your, or my redemption? How could He have done anything for generations yet unborn? What is the connection? No—religions have done much to retard human progress. Churchill's history speaks of the battle for power between the Catholics and Protestants and whichever one won heads were chopped off the leaders of the opposing faith—which professes 'turning the other cheek'.

In our own Civil War each side was praying to the same God for the destruction of the other side. What could be more stupid? And don't forget that our moral codes were fully developed long before the Christian Era. "Orgins of Western Morality", by Harkness, points this out so well. The codes established by the Medes, Persians, Egyptians, Greeks and Romans were the basis for all of our so-called Christian codes of today, and all of these were developed long before the Christian Era began—so let us keep our facts straight!

You speak of the Easter story, the Crucifixion and Resurrection just as if there were recorded records of these happenings. You speak of the rock before the door to the cave. First of all, why would anyone's body be placed in a cave? And a few followers would have had a hard time to roll a rock sufficiently large to close the cave, before it. This is all pure myth and most unlikely myth at that. Historians have spent their life on these studies and there isn't a one who would, or could, prove any such happenings.

You speak of the creation of the world and the eventual destruction of the world by God. Our Earth—compared to the Universe—is a tiny speck of dust only, and everything on it is dependent upon our Sun for life. Our Sun is a star and the astronomers have pretty well worked out the history of all stars—these flaming masses of incandescent gasses—which have a life cycle of many billions of years. Our Sun is, perhaps, 2/3rds



of the way on its life cycle. Eventually, in the final stages of its life it will probably expand sufficiently to vaporize the earth and all upon it. But that will be natural and the evolutionary life of a star and will have no more to do with God's destruction of the earth than He had to do with its creation, originally.

We must not live in the past; we must progress, study, think, question, analyze and try to come up with the most intelligent answer possible. Many of these cannot be definite, but where the old superstitions of the past have done so much to retard one, let us break from them once and for all and stick to truth and facts and legendary wishful thinking of the dim distant past, which is wholly unsubstantiated by the past historical records we have today.

You could have put much of this thought into your editorial, pointing out the tremendous progress and development of Man—particularly in recent times. It has all been accomplished by his own efforts with not the slightest evidence of any supernatural Power guiding or retarding his progress.

Let us give credit where credit is due and let us build a nation founded on intelligence and knowledge and combat fear, superstition, hypocrisy and untruths on every hand.

Having just returned from the Orient and having seen some of its teeming millions, the Western World must wake up to the fact that we must progress along the line outlined above, if we want to maintain our position in this world. The Orient needs knowledge, needs education, needs guidance and probably one of the greatest crying needs of all, is birth control; but here again we run into the voice of the church crying out to retard, rather than to educate. The church, in the past, has had much to account for and I see little evidence of its changing its ways.

You try to tie in development of science with that of Christianity. Nothing could be further from the facts. We have seen the so-called "godless" Russians surpass us in our scientific endeavors at (least momentarily) which is conclusive proof that human progress is not limited to those who believe in God!

If we could just get people to "think," there is hope for humanity. I have tried to do much in this line, to make people think and reason things out, and I hope that in taking time to write this letter it will make you think, because much of what you said in your editorial is not evidence of clear thinking or analysis.

May I have your comments?

—B. T. Rocca, Sr.,

Dear Sir:

It seems strange to me, here on the bed, that they have not brought the February Humanist Digest to me yet. I have been expecting it since about the middle of February.

Here on my back, in my 92nd year, my eyes are failing so it's hard to read fine print; can do fairly well reading over my past written rhymes.

I like what is written in Humanist World Digest. I must lie down now and rest.

—F. H. Shuler, E.W. 219B, Memorial Hospital,  
Arkansas City, Kan.

---

Dear Editor:

I have a soft spot in my consciousness for Humanism because years ago I conducted the laymen's league service of the Unitarian Church in Seattle and delivered the sermon, if it could be called that. "Humanist" got it and printed it. But I don't have time for half what I have to do. I shall be 89 June 23rd next. So with regret I must refuse to follow my desire to resubscribe. My wife will be the same age August 7th. But I enclose \$2 for what help it may be to the liberal cause.

—James Frank Beede, Palo Alto, Calif.

---

Dear Sir:

I have been a Humanist for many years, entirely due to an inquiring mind and after many years of study. There are not many of us and I almost despaired of meeting with anyone else of a like mind when I saw your advertisement in "The Progressive" magazine to which I have subscribed for years. I acted immediately.

When I received your February edition of the Humanist World Digest I was elated and very happy to finally find an organization, and, above all, an established religion to which I can honestly and wholeheartedly subscribe to as concurring with my own beliefs.

Now I would like to know if there are any members in the immediate vicinity of my home whom I can contact? Surely, out of the some 12 million human beings within the Metropolitan New York area there may be actually many of us and I am sure you can assist me.

For service to humanity and the furtherance of World Humanism, please accept my hearty good wishes.

W.H.C., Jamaica, N.Y.

## EDITORIAL

### Billy Graham Comes to Town

As this issue of the Digest is made ready, Billy Graham is holding a series of meetings at the Cow Palace (an Agricultural Exhibition Hall) in San Francisco. Graham is a good drawing card because he is packing the barn with the curious and devoted.

As to our opinion on like affairs, a quotation from Harold Scott in last November's Ram Horn seems to fit this revival affair well, namely,

**"The Atlantic** for July had an article by R. B. Robertson on 'How Billy Graham Saved Scotland' that was a literary masterpiece. The September issue of the same magazine has a defense of Billy Graham by David H. C. Read that is not a masterpiece. Mr. Read, like all defenders of Billy Graham, uses considerable space asserting Billy's sincerity. I wonder why Billy's friends feel that is necessary. I'd think that might be taken for granted and not be imputed to him as righteousness. That Billy Graham has a pleasant personality doesn't appear to me to be relevant. The defense rests upon the undisputed fact that Billy attracts crowds and makes converts. If Billy teaches a shallow gospel making



E. O. CORSON

full use of the myths and superstitions of an outgrown theology but gets people to accept same, is it good or evil he is doing?

"Can you imagine a group of astronomers holding meetings for an astrologer and justifying the movement by attendance figures? It seems to me the clergymen backing Billy Graham are a cynical lot. Their attitude seems to be, "Of course it's not true but he increases attendance and church income."

And now a further comment. Sometime back, according to the press, Graham went to his sheep corral and his ram seems to have objected to the presence of another male, regardless of kind. The results were disastrous for the famous crusader because, if the press reports were at all dependable, this old Ram just butted Graham all over the corral. His prayers for mercy, uttered from this tiny micron of cosmic dust known as Earth, didn't get any response from any God or Gods stationed in some far-off heavenly place. The only thing that saved Billy was the hole in the fence, which he headed for and the ram, not giving a hoot about his prayers, gave him a final butt that put him through



it. It is suspected that Graham will not depend upon prayer the next time he climbs into the corral but will lasso the ram and tie him up securely first.

This Ram incident can be used as an example of the powers for evil we have in the world and the old-time religion, as such, doesn't have the answers for combatting it, as for example, it has been stated that those who profess the old-time religion in the United States now number 100 million and at the same time crime and juvenile delinquency has risen to its highest point. In another report on a prison, we have 1420 inmates with 1408 professing some church connection and 12 no church. This would sum up that about 99 percent of these criminals come as declared church members and the balance, or 1 percent, coming from the short half of the rest of our citizens who do not profess any orthodox church connections.

What are the answers to all this; this ram type of villain that put Billy Graham through the fence, his religion and all? Well, the answer is as simple as this. Develop a code of ethics and morals that are geared to the ideals and needs of democratic and liberty-loving people of the nations throughout the whole world. The members of old churches and old national orders must, through open and free access to modern scientific methods that the nuclear age has opened up, reorient their religious conceptions in order that they may cooperate in carrying their share in building this new world that the nuclear age has made a compelling must.

Albert Sweitzer tells us why, in his recent release to 3000 daily newspapers, relative to meaning and effects of the improper handling nuclear forces which endanger our people today and the generations of the future. Let us recognize man as the highest product of creative process and as such commands our highest allegiance. Attendant to that, man carries the responsibilities for the uses of things he has developed for today and for the future.

I conclude with this thought from Robert Ingersoll:

"Teach men not to sacrifice this world for some other, but to turn their attention to the natural, to the affairs of this life. Teach them that theology has no known foundation, that it was born of ignorance and fear, that it has hardened the heart, polluted the imagination and made fiends of man. . . .

"Theology is not for this world. It is no part of real religion. It has nothing to do with goodness or virtue. Religion does not consist of worshipping gods, but in adding to the well-being, the

happiness of man. No human being knows whether any god exists or not, and all that has been said and written about "our god" or the gods of other people has no known fact for a foundation. Words without thoughts, clouds without rain. . . .

\* \* \*

## THE LASTING THOUGHT

I don't know what I would do if I had only "two minutes to live," or what message I should give to the world. If I really thought I had only that time to live, I should like to take time to think up a line and noble message so that my last words might have the dignity of those we have read about, which probably weren't last words at all.

However, I think if I had the power to do what I wish to do for humanity, I would give to every person the ability to put himself into the place of every other person in the world.

In this way he would have that education, that culture which comes of the highest quality of imagination, and that quality, I take it, has been most perfectly exemplified in the poets and saviors of the race, in that they were able to feel and suffer what others were feeling and suffering, and when we come to a time when we realize just what the other fellow is suffering we will be moved by the desire to help him, and when we are moved by the desire to help him we come to a time when we see that this help must be administered intelligently, and ultimately we realize that it is the denial of equality, the denial of liberty, political and economic, in the world which is the cause of most of its suffering. If we had a world made up of people possessing this quality of imagination, this kind of culture, we would soon do away with the causes of involuntary poverty, and to do away with involuntary poverty would mean to do away with practically all the crime and vice and most of the suffering in the world.—Brand Whitlock.

\* \* \*

"We have committed the Golden Rule to memory; let us now commit it to life.

We have preached Brotherhood for centuries; we now meet to find a material basis for brotherhood. Government must be made the organ of Fraternity—a working-form for comradelove.

Think on this—work for this.

—Edwin Markham

## THE MEMBERSHIP ROLL CALL

With great liberal magazines such as the Progressive and the New Leader raising their subscriptions rates and asking subscriber aid, we don't feel embarrassed to say we, too, must raise the subscription rate to the Humanist World Digest to **\$1.50 per years starting July 1st.**

We need your help. While the old dollar rate holds please take advantage of it and get your renewal in. Send in a subscription for a friend or acquaintance whom you feel would appreciate the missionary work the Digest is promoting toward man's objective approach for his survival here in a peaceful democratic order of things.

Also, send in lists of people whom you feel are likely prospects. Additional contributions are also appreciated.

---

### SUBSCRIPTION FORM

Please enter my subscription to the Humanist World Digest for ..... years at \$1 per year (on or before July 1, 1958).  
(Add gift subscriptions on separate sheet)

**Membership Form** (Dues include Digest subscription)

I wish to apply for membership in the Humanist World Fellowship and enclose \$..... to cover annual dues, as indicated.

Check ( ) \$5 regular ( ) \$10 Contributing

One ( ) \$25 Sustaining ( ) \$100 or more, Sponsor

Total amount enclosed: \$.....

NAME .....

ADDRESS .....

(Please Type or Print)

**Mail to: HUMANIST WORLD DIGEST**  
**1011 Heinz Avenue - Berkeley 10, California**



## INTERPRETING HUMANIST OBJECTIVES

**HUMANIST WORLD FELLOWSHIP** is a religious association incorporated under the laws of the State of California with all the rights and privileges of such organizations. It enrolls members, charters local societies, affiliates like-minded groups, establishes educational projects and ordains ministers.

**HUMANIST WORLD FELLOWSHIP** defines religion in terms of two inseparable historical processes: (1) the ages-long quest for ultimate human values; and (2) the continuous effort to realize these values in individual experience and in just and harmonious social relations. Humanism affirms the inviolable dignity of the individual and declares democracy the only acceptable method of social progress.

**MODERN HUMANISM** seeks to unite the whole of mankind in ultimate religious fellowship. It strives for the integration of the whole personality and the perfection of social relationships as the objectives of religious effort. Humanism, in broad terms, tries to achieve a good life in a good world. **HUMANIST WORLD FELLOWSHIP** is a shared quest for that good life.

Above all, man is not to be regarded as an instrument that serves and glorifies totalitarianism — economic, political or ecclesiastical.

**HUMANISM** insists that man is the highest product of the creative process within our knowledge, and as such commands our highest allegiance. He is the center of our concern. He is not to be treated as a means to some other end, but as an end in himself. Heretofore man has been considered a means to further the purposes of gods, states, economic systems, social organizations; but Humanism would reverse this and make all these things subservient to the fullest development of the potentialities of human nature as the supreme end of all endeavor. This is the cornerstone of Humanism, which judges all institutions according to their contribution to human life.

**HUMANISM** recognizes that all mankind are brothers with a common origin. We are all of one blood with common interests and a common life and should march with mutual purposes toward a common goal. This means that we must eradi-

cate racial antagonisms, national jealousies, class struggles, religious prejudices and individual hatreds. Human solidarity requires that each person consider himself a cooperating part of the whole human race striving toward a commonwealth of man built upon the principles of justice, good will and service.

**HUMANISM** seeks to understand human experience by means of human inquiry. Despite the claims of revealed religions, all of the real knowledge acquired by the race stems from human inquiry. Humanists investigate facts and experience, verify these, and formulate thought accordingly. However, nothing that is human is foreign to the Humanist. Institutions, speculations, supposed supernatural revelations are all products of some human mind so must be understood and evaluated. The whole body of our culture — art, poetry, literature, music, philosophy and science must be studied and appreciated in order to be understood and appraised.

**HUMANISM** has no blind faith in the perfectibility of man but assumes that his present condition, as an individual and as a member of society, can be vastly improved. It recognizes the limitations of human nature but insists upon developing man's natural talents to their highest point. It asserts that man's environment, within certain limits, can be arranged so as to enhance his development. Environment should be brought to bear on our society so as to help to produce healthy, sane, creative, happy individuals in a social structure that offers the most opportunity for living a free and full life.

**HUMANISM** accepts the responsibility for the conditions of human life and relies entirely upon human efforts for their improvement. Man has made his own history and he will create his own future—for good or ill. The Humanist determines to make this world a fit place to live in and human life worth living. This is a hard but challenging task. It could result gloriously.

These brief paragraphs indicate the objectives and methods of **HUMANIST WORLD FELLOWSHIP** as a religious association. Upon the basis of such a program it invites all like-minded people into membership and communion. Let us go forward together.



STARR KING SCHOOL FOR THE MINISTRY  
2441 LE CONTE AVE.  
BERKELEY, CALIF.